



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/729,622	12/05/2003	Mark E. Deem	514362000203	2927
7590	10/30/2007		EXAMINER	
JOHN S. NAGY (FULWIDER, PATTON, LEE & UTECHT, LLP) HOWARD HUGHES CENTER 6060 CENTER DRIVE, TENTH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90045			TRUONG, KEVIN THAO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3734	
			MAIL DATE	
			10/30/2007	DELIVERY MODE
				PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/729,622	DEEM ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Kevin T. Truong	3734	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on T.D. and Amendt. 08/092/2007.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 53-74 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 53-74 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/2007.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Note: this is in response to amendment filed 08/09/2007. Also, A terminal disclaimer filed 08/09/2007 was not signed by the attorney of record which must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b). As a result, terminal disclaimer was not overcome the nonstatutory double patenting rejection as stated in previous office action.

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 53-74 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 34-54 of U.S. Patent No. Deem et al. (6,558,400). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the relatively subject matter claimed in the instant application discloses such as the method for reducing the volume of a stomach cavity

including the steps of positioning a device within the stomach cavity; acquiring tissue form the interior of the stomach cavity with the device; forming a pouch by securing a fastener the acquired tissue within the stomach cavity in which separate from the main volume, and wherein the pouch adapted to received food from the esophagus would have been obvious in view of the relatively subject matter of the patent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 53, 55-64, and 66-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pietrafitta et al. (U.S. 5,355,897).

Note in figures 1-11 of Pietrafitta et al., discloses the method for reducing the volume of a stomach cavity including the steps of positioning a device within the stomach cavity; acquiring tissue form the interior of the stomach cavity with the device; forming a pouch by securing a fastener the acquired tissue within the stomach cavity in which separate from the main volume, and wherein the pouch adapted to received food from the esophagus.

4. Claims 53, 55-64, and 66-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Baker (U.S. 6,197,022).

Note in figures 1-9 of Baker, discloses the method for reducing the volume of a stomach cavity including the steps of positioning a device within the stomach

cavity; acquiring tissue form the interior of the stomach cavity with the device; forming a pouch by securing a fastener the acquired tissue within the stomach cavity in which separate from the main volume, and wherein the pouch adapted to received food from the esophagus.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 54, 65, and 71-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pietrafitta et al. (U.S. 5,355,897).

Pietrafitta et al disclosed the claimed invention as stated above except for the pouch having a volume less than about 30 cc. However, forming a pouch having such a volume is considered obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art because such a pouch volume would likely allow an obese person to overcome morbid obesity by allowing the person to feel full and therefore, refrain from eating more.

7. Claims 54, 65, and 71-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker (U.S. 6,197,022).

Baker disclosed the claimed invention as stated above except for the pouch having a volume less than about 30 cc. However, forming a pouch having such a volume is considered obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art because such

a pouch volume would likely allow an obese person to overcome morbid obesity by allowing the person to feel full and therefore, refrain from eating more.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 08/09/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 53, 64, and 71 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin T. Truong whose telephone number is 571-272-4705. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Hayes can be reached on 571-272-4959. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Kevin T. Truong
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3734

ktt